



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,970	09/24/2003	Katsumi Abe	121036-060	4886

35684 7590 03/17/2006

BUTZEL LONG  
350 SOUTH MAIN STREET  
SUITE 300  
ANN ARBOR, MI 48104

EXAMINER

SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,970

Applicant(s)

ABE ET AL.

Examiner

Kriellion A. Sanders

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

Applicant's amendment to the claims is sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2003-183443 in view of Boudaris et al, US Publication No. 2003/0077465. US Patent No. 6,870,002 is the English equivalent of the Japanese reference and will be used for translation purposes.

JP 2003-18343 teaches a rubber composition, which comprises 100 parts by weight of a rubber mixture consisting of 70-95 wt. % of solid rubber and 30-5 wt. % of liquid rubber reactive on the solid rubber, and 450-1,000 parts by weight of magnetic powder. As the solid rubber, nitrile rubber (NBR), acrylic rubber (ACM), ethyl acrylate-ethylene copolymer rubber (AEM), ethylene-propylene copolymer rubber (EPDM), fluororubber (FKM), etc. may be used, according to the desired application. Since applicant's ethylene methyl acrylate rubber differs from ethylene ethyl acrylate rubber of the JP reference only in that it is the next adjacent

Art Unit: 1714

homologue, the use of the former would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

The liquid rubber that is reactive on the solid rubber is a liquid rubber having the same structure as or similar structure to that of the solid rubber and may be cross-linkable with the same vulcanizing agent as for the solid rubber. Patentee indicates that when liquid rubber that is reactive on solid rubber is added to the conventional magnetic powder-containing rubber, the processability of the compositions may be improved without any deterioration of physical properties to the rubber, while maintaining a high magnetic force necessary to the magnetic powder. This process also maintains the lower viscosity of the rubber compound and maintains heat resistance and flexibility of moldings. The patented rubber compositions can be suitably used as rubber magnets designed specifically for sensors in magnetic encoders used at the encoder positions such as wheel speed sensors, etc. The invention utilizes Sr ferrite as magnetic powder, as well as (N-cyclohexyl-2-benzothiazyl sulfonamide as cross-linking aid. (Amides are the reaction products of amines and acids. Therefor the curing aids, (vulcanization aids of the patent), are amine based).

Boudaris et al discloses compositions, as well as methods for making said compositions comprising magnetic materials such as ferrites, rare earth-cobalt magnets of one or more of the rare earth elements such as Sm or Pr, yttrium (Y), lanthanum (La), cerium (Ce), or other magnetic materials including, for instance, manganese-bismuth and manganese-aluminum. The method of the invention is not limited to any particular magnetic material, and the scope of the invention is therefore not limited as such. The magnetic composition includes about 70 wt-% or more of the magnetic material to provide sufficient attractive force. Patentee indicates that it is

Art Unit: 1714

impractical to employ more than 95 wt-% of the magnetic material because of production concerns, and also because of the difficulty of retaining more than this in the binder material. Further-more, including more than about 95 wt-% of the magnetic material is said to lead to a rougher surface. The magnetic material may be supplied in a powder form. The magnetic strength of the finished product is a function of the amount of magnetic material or powder in the mix, the surface area, thickness, and method of magnetization (e.g. whether it is aligned or not). The thermoplastic material, often referred to in the industry as a thermoplastic binder, suitable for use in the process of the patented invention may include any polymeric material that is readily processable with the magnetic material. Such thermoplastic materials include both thermoplastic elastomers and non-elastomers or any mixture thereof. Examples of thermoplastic elastomers suitable for use herein include, but are not limited to, natural and synthetic rubbers. These include but are not limited to, polyolefins including polyethylene, polypropylene, polybutylene and copolymers and terpolymers thereof such as ethylene vinyl acetate copolymers (EVA), ethylene n-butyl acrylates (EnBA), ethylene methyl (meth) acrylates including ethylene methyl acrylates (EMA),

Boudaris documents that ethylene methyl acrylates and ferrites are conventionally used in rubber compositions having magnetic properties. The use of these components in the JP invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

See the entirety of each document.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 1714

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is no description in Abe et al that uses only ethyl acrylate ethylene copolymer (AEM) as a solid rubber component and a liquid rubber component according to the present invention and that the examples that Abe et al discloses are liquid NBR, liquid EPDM and liquid FKM, and further more that the working examples of Abe et al only involve the use of NBR.

Applicant states that his comparative data in the specification utilizes ethylene-methyl-acrylate copolymer as a solid rubber (that is exemplified by Abe et al) and ethylene-methyl-acrylate as a liquid rubber (not taught by Abe et al). Applicant further indicates that curing this rubber by amine vulcanization results in excellent heat resistance.

These arguments and comparisons are not persuasive to overcome the rejection. The teaching of Abe et al is not limited to the components exemplified in the working examples. In the response of 1/6/06 at the last paragraph of page 8, applicant specifically states that ethylene-methyl-acrylate copolymer as a solid rubber is exemplified by Abe et al.

Applicant is further advised that the claims, particularly claim 1, differs from Abe et al only in that Abe et al employs ethylene ethyl acrylate copolymer as opposed to ethylene-methyl-acrylate copolymer. Applicant's ethylene-methyl-acrylate copolymer differs from the ethylene ethyl acrylate copolymer of Abe et al only in that it is the next adjacent homologue and is therefore considered to be an obvious variant.

Art Unit: 1714

Applicant's arguments are based on limitations that are not included within the claims, such as the physical state of the copolymer. In other words the claims do not indicate whether that physical state is liquid or solid.

Applicant's argument that Boudaris is unrelated to the field of encoders is not persuasive. Applicant's encoders are magnetic encoders. Boudaris relates to magnetic substrates. Therefore, Boudaris relates to any species of magnetic substrates including magnetic encoders.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize the next adjacent homologue, ethylene methyl acrylate copolymer of Boudaris et al in lieu of the ethyl acrylate ethylene copolymer of Abe et al with the expectation of achieving at least equivalent results absent a clear showing of unexpected results attributable to such a variation.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1714


Since applicant points out that the US Patent No. 6870002 has the same inventive entity as the present invention, claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of US Patent No. 687002 in view of Boudaris et al for the reason applied above.

This is an obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kriellion A. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-272-1122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Kriellion A. Sanders  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

ks